

PTOL-415A (10-07)  
 Approved for use through 10/31/2007. OMB 0751-3601  
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/575,086 First Named Applicant: Matthias Zoch  
 Examiner: Michele M. Kidwell Art Unit: 3761 Status of Application: pending

#### Tentative Participants:

(1) Oliver Friz (2) Eckhard Oltmann  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: Wednesday June 25 Proposed Time: 9 am (AM/PM)

#### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>see attached e-mail</u>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

#### Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

see attached e-mail

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 6/25/08.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Paul Vincent  
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Paul Vincent

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

37,461

Registration Number, if applicable

M Kidwell  
 Examiner/SPE Signature

17031507US

**Preparation of an in person interview scheduled on Wednesday, June 25, 9.00 p.m.,  
Examiner Michèle Kidwell**

**Applicants will be represented by Dr. Eckhard Oltmann (Head of Patent Department of  
Paul Hartmann AG) and Oliver Friz (Applicants' European Patent Attorney)**

Having carefully studied Applicants' response dated September 18, 2007 with independent claims 11, 16 and 18 and Office Action dated May 16, 2008 it seems that there is a misunderstanding of the claim language and/or of the specific disclosure of Hamajima US 2001/0039406 A1, paragraphs [0094], [0095]. Even if the ranges disclosed in [0041] and [0044] of '406 were to be regarded as disclosing Applicants' ranges of 5 to 30% by weight hydrophilic melt-blown microfibres and 70 to 95% particular superabsorbing material Applicants' broadest claim 11 would not be anticipated by US' 406. On page 2 Examiner refers to [0094] where a mass per unit area of  $20 \text{ g/m}^2$  is disclosed. However, this para does not refer to a melt-blown micro fibre layer but to the core/sheath type layer with a fibre diameter of 2.2 dtex. In Applicants' response it was also this conjugate fibre layer which was argued to be a staple fibre layer rather than a melt-blown fibre layer. The point is that the [0094]-layer consists of coarser bicomponent fibres having 2.2 dtex. These fibres are no (melt-blown) microfibres but separately formed staple fibres which need suction heat-bonding for stabilizing the non-woven fabric [0094]. The basis weight of  $20 \text{ g/m}^2$  disclosed in [0094] may therefore not be referred to the hydrophilic melt-blown microfibres of independent claims 11, 16 and 18 having a mass per unit area of 6 to  $25 \text{ g/m}^2$ . Should Examiner refer to [0095] there are two sandwich-like inner layers of melt-blown microfibres having a basis weight of  $60 \text{ g/m}^2$  together. Member A according to [0094] and [0095] discloses a sandwiched, layered arrangement of melt-blown fibres and superabsorbent particles rather than a homogeneous three-dimensional network surrounding and immobilizing said particular superabsorbing material as claimed. We are enclosing a sketch of member A which clearly differs from the subject-matter of independent claims 11, 16 and 18.

The basic idea of Applicants' invention is: The storage layer having high amounts of super-absorbing materials and rather low amounts of melt-blown microfibres (6 to 25 g/m<sup>2</sup>). When forming this storage layer the microfibres form a dense, three-dimensional network surrounding and immobilizing said particular superabsorbing materials. The melt-blown process is performed such that a plurality of melt connections is formed between the microfibres itself and no or only few melt connections are provided between the microfibres and the particular superabsorbing material. This may be done such that the further clearly structural feature is attained, namely that the strength in a wet state is at least 40% of the strength thereof in a dry state.

Applicants respectfully request to be allowed to put forward and explain the nature of the invention as claimed by independent claims 11, 16 and 18.

Further more Applicants would like to respectfully note that Applicants fail to identify any response as regards independent claims 16 and 18 in the latest Office Action (apart from the form listing the rejected claims).

(O. Friz)

Patent Attorney